UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,115	05/13/2008	Paul Matthew Freestone	7733P008	4411
8791 7590 02/17/2010 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP			EXAMINER	
1279 OAKMEA	AD PARKWAY	CRANMER, LAURIE K		
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3636	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/17/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/577,115	FREESTONE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Laurie K. Cranmer	3636				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 /</u>	April 2006.					
	s action is non-final.					
·—	e this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application	٦.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 April 2006</u> is/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/24/06</u> .	5) Notice of Informal Page 6) Other:	atent Application				

Application/Control Number: 10/577,115 Page 2

Art Unit: 3636

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the support member with stopper means and the triangular cross-section of the cavity must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 3636

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7-11, 14, 17, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 7, line 3 "triangular" is confusing since it is not clear where the triangular cross sectional shape is located.

In claim 8, line 2 "the cavity walls configuration" has no definite antecedent basis.

In claim 10, lines 1-2 "the rod-like extending portion" has no definite antecedent basis.

In claim 11, line 2 "both ends" is confusing since it is not known what these are.

In claim 14, line 2 "formed" is a process limitation that does not receive patentable weight in an article claim.

In claim 17, lines 2-3, it is not clear what the "stopper means" are.

In claim 20, line 3 "the length" and "the elastomeric or natural rubber material" have no definite antecedent basis.

In claim 21, line 3 "the elastomeric or natural rubber material" has no definite antecedent basis.

Claim 9 is indefinite in that it depends from an indefinite base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/577,115 Page 4

Art Unit: 3636

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 12-21, so far as definite, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Desanta (4640548).

The frame is 30+32+40, the support member includes 34, 36, the recline mechanism includes a housing which includes an extending portion of the frame 58, a cavity (between 42 and 50), a biasing means 60 which is adjustable by 62, which would alter the length and density of 60, the stopper means is 48, which contacts both the frame 40 (via 52) and the support member 34, wherein the extending portion extends longitudinally into the cavity and is pivotable laterally about a central pivot point 44.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 4 and 6-11, so far as definite, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desanta as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Heidmann et al (2004/0051362).

Heidmann teaches seating furniture including a frame 103, a support member 34, a housing including a rod-like extending portion 107, a substantially triangular cavity 104, wherein the cavity walls are centrally-waisted, and a cylindrical polymeric biasing means 101 extending about the extending portion 107, wherein the extending portion extends laterally into the cavity and it pivotable longitudinally about a central pivot point in the cavity.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Desanta device such that it had a centrally-waisted cavity as taught to be old by Heidmann thereby providing the obvious advantage and predictable results of limit points of the extending portion relative to the cavity.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Piretti, Koch et al, Lee, Fields et al, Hensel et al, Chiang, Vogtherr, Ambasz, Hodgdon, Brauning, Mathews et al, Valtri, van Zee et al, Chen and Willette et al all teach devices similar to that of the instant invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie K. Cranmer whose telephone number is (571) 272-6855. The examiner can normally be reached on M-W.

Application/Control Number: 10/577,115 Page 6

Art Unit: 3636

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-6670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Laurie K. Cranmer Primary Examiner Art Unit 3636

/Laurie K. Cranmer/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3636